

5318

**MEETING MINUTES
REVISION OF THE PHASE III DRAFT RFI/RI REPORT
EG&G, OPERABLE UNIT NUMBER 1, ROCKY FLATS PLANT
HELD 22 JUNE 1993**

Meeting Attendees (also see attached sign-up list):

Cindy Gee and Kelly O'Neill (EG&G)
Ted Ball and Terry Smith (PRC)
Paul Singh and Scott Grace (DOE)
Joyce Schroeder (LATO/RF)
Gary Kleeman (EPA)
Joe Schieffelin and Jeff Swanson (CDH)
Michael A. Anderson, Ph.D., P.E., Ken F. Napp, Celia A. Greenman, Betty F. Freeman, and Janell B. Bergman, P.G., CPG (WESTON)

Items Discussed:

1. Introduction (Cindy Gee) - Cindy Gee stated that the purpose of the meeting was to present the major changes/revisions to the RI report to the agencies and their consultants to ensure that their concerns/comments on the Draft version were being addressed. She encouraged feedback and stated that this was to be an interactive meeting.
2. Site Conceptual Model (Celia Greenman) - The presentation materials are provided in the attachment. The questions raised during the presentation are presented below.

Upper Hydrostratigraphic Unit

Question (Gary Kleeman): Has there been a change to the bedrock surface map?

Response (Celia Greenman): WESTON has verified the accuracy of the map; no changes are required.

Question (Gary Kleeman): How deep is the weathered claystone comprising the upper hydrostratigraphic unit (UHSU)?

Response (Celia Greenman): Approximately 35 feet of weathered claystone is present in the UHSU based on the observations made during the french drain construction.

Saturation

DOCUMENT CLASSIFICATION
REVIEW WAIVER PER
CLASSIFICATION OFFICE

Question (Scott Grace): Are there any reasons for the dry areas?

Response (Celia Greenman): Yes. They correspond to bedrock highs.

Question (Joe Schieffelin): Any changes to the bedrock topography map?

Response (Celia Greenman): No.

Question (Joe Schieffelin): Can you explain what was meant by maybe the wells had not recovered?

Response (Celia Greenman): Maybe certain wells were sampled too soon after installation or developed and thus had not recovered to static water levels.

Question (Joe Schieffelin): January water table map. Can you explain what was meant by maybe the wells had not recovered?

Response (Celia Greenman): Maybe certain wells were sampled too soon after installation or developed and thus had not recovered to static water levels.

Comment (Gary Kleeman): Add a note to the January water table stating why the areas are denoted as dry and that the wells have been wet since.

Question (Joe Schieffelin): Does the top of bedrock map portray slumpblocks as bedrock?

Response (Celia Greenman): Yes. The top of bedrock corresponds to top of claystone regardless of competency.

Issue (Joe Schieffelin): Concerned about the saturated thickness map because the UHSU was not always fully penetrated.

Response (Mike Anderson): There is no point or benefit to conducting additional investigation to delineate.

Question (Scott Grace): Has WESTON seen Technical Memorandum 8 for OU2?

Response (Ken Napp): Yes.

French Drain

Comment (Paul Singh): There is a well by the sump that is wet. WESTON must explain fluctuations to explain contradiction with the quarterly report if the RI states that all wells downgradient of the drain are dry.

Response (Celia Greenman): WESTON will contact Mark Burmeister (EG&G) for construction details for MW-1 and MW-2. WESTON will address the fluctuating water level data as required.

Issue (Joe Schieffelin): Draft RI presented that the colluvial lithology could control pathway.

Response (Celia Greenman): Yes. Clay layers in the colluvium could act as a hinderance to groundwater flow.

Concern (Joe Schieffelin): Concerned that the water table maps show a potential pathway for groundwater to Woman Creek and he believes there is little evidence for this since the french drain was dry during excavation.

3. Fate and Transport (Ken Napp) - The presentation materials are provided in the attachment. The questions raised during the presentation are presented below.

Question (Cindy Gee): Is WESTON getting to the point CDH wanted to see?

Response (Joe Schieffelin): Yes. He wanted "history matching" and he is seeing it.

Comment (Gary Kleeman): There is not a well "right" in the bedrock low downgradient of IHSS 119.1. If there were, maybe the data would show that the contaminants (volatile constituents) moved farther downgradient.

Response (Ken Napp): The wells are right on the edge, very close to the "v" in the channel.

Comment (Joe Schieffelin): Concerned about lithology. WESTON must look at French Drain lithologic descriptions.

Response (Ken Napp): WESTON will clarify clay descriptions and review French Drain data.

Question (Joe Schieffelin): Is there DNAPL?

Response (Ken Napp): The evidence for DNAPL is inconclusive and circumstantial. In addition, remediation of DNAPL is technically difficult.

Comment (Cindy Gee): Based on DNAPL sampling of four wells, DNAPL is not present.

4. Database (Betty Freeman) - Presentation materials are provided in the attachments. Betty briefly explained that RFEDS is a "house" for data and does not provide "working" databases. She explained the processes involved in formatting the data into a useable database.

EPA, CDH, and EG&G will receive diskette copies of the data on Wednesday 23 June 1993. An additional data diskette set will also be forwarded to DOE.

5. Data Sets (Janell Bergman) - Presentation materials are provided in the attachments. Janell reviewed the stations selected for the RI and provided a summary of the differences between the Work Plan, Draft RI, and Final RI stations. In addition, the time frames for the analytical data set was discussed along with the differences between the Draft and Final RI analytical data set.

6. Comments on the Section 3 submittal (Gary Kleeman) - p. 3-27: This is not the appropriate place to discuss the water useability. PRC stated that the Driscoll citation on p. 3-29 is incorrect.

Action: WESTON will remove the water usage discussion from Section 3 and will clarify the Driscoll citation context.

7. Water Budget (Ken Napp) - Ken asked if the agencies still wanted to see a water budget performed. WESTON will assume that the water can be used and therefore a water budget is no longer needed.

Conclusion: A water budget will not be provided in the Final RI.

8. Summary (Cindy Gee) - EG&G requests feedback from the agencies as soon as possible due to the tight schedule.

6.21.93

OU 1 Meeting

<u>Attendee</u>	<u>Representing</u>	<u>Phone</u>
Cindy Gee	EG&G	966-8550
Teel Ball	PRC	295-1101
Terry Smith	PRC	295-1101
PAUL SINGH	RFO	966-4651
Janell Bergman	RFU	980-6800
Loyce Schroeder	LATO/RF	966-3543
Mike Anderson	WESTON	980-6800
Kelly O'Neill	EG&G	966-8666
Gary Kleeman	EPA	294-1071
JEFF SWANSON	CDH	692-3416
Joe Schieffelin	CDH	692-3386
Scott Grace	DOE	966-7199

Alia
Napp

(14)